

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-8, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,901).

Contrary to the position taken by the Patent Office (PTO), Hunter does not teach the claimed features of Applicant's invention. For instance, as noted in the previous response, Hunter fails to teach reestablishing a telephone connection to the user using the user's originator telephone number and confirming the user using the temporary password after the original telephone connection has ended and the article information has been retrieved by the on-line shopping service and thereafter providing the article information retrieved and arranging a transaction according to the user's selection.

In Hunter's system, the central system processes a product order by identifying the customer using a call no. ID or a pin at the time the caller places the call. See, Hunter at column 3, lines 12-16; column 6, lines 13-19, lines 58-67; column 7, lines 1-7. Thereafter, the customer is prompted to enter a product number for the product being ordered. See, Hunter at column 7, lines 8-17. There is no disclosure in Hunter for "reestablishing a telephone connection to the caller using the caller's originator telephone number and [at that time] confirming the user using the temporary password received [previously]", as recited in claims 1, 9 and 13.

The Office Action indicates, on page 7 of the Office Action, that Hunter teaches the aforementioned feature since a "customer supplies a telephone number used by POTS/Voice return call from system or call number ID" and "a caller using the purchasing features has his/her identity confirmed using a PIN". However, as noted above, the call number ID or pin number is used to verify the customer at the time the order occurs or product information is requested.

Further, the PTO notes in the Office Action, "that the central system processes a caller's product information request the same as a product order so that the appropriate merchant can follow-up as appropriate with the caller making the request" on page 6. Consistent with this assertion, it is apparent that the customer is identified when the caller places the call to request product information and not after a connection is reestablished with the caller. Hunter does not teach confirming the caller after reestablishing a telephone connection and the rejection fails, for at least this reason, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Hunter also fails to teach, "after reestablishing the connection and confirming the user, providing the article information retrieved and arranging a transaction according to the user's selection", as recited in claims 1, 9 and 13. The PTO asserts that Hunter teaches this feature, relying upon the description in column 8, lines 35-46. The description indicates that when a product order number is recognized, it is routed to the product information request module that calls up the requested information package from a database and transmits it to the customer by the customer's preferred transmission mode. This description does not teach the aforementioned feature. Transmitting requested information to the customer by the customer's preferred transmission mode, at best, implies that a connection can be

reestablished with the customer; however, this functionality does not indicate that the system confirms the user at that time using the temporary password.

For the aforementioned reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 9 and 13.

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-8, 10-12 and 15-21 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 9 and 13. Moreover, these claims are further distinguishable over the applied reference by the additional elements recited therein.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on at least the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application. In the event the instant application can be placed in better form, Applicant requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 13, 2009

By: Kimberly McLean  
Kimberly McLean  
Registration No. 62,378

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620